

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/936,949 | 05/15/2002 | Ragner Lyng | 2001-1446A | 3059 |
| 513 | 7590 04/29/2003 | • | | |
| WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 2033 K STREET N. W. SUITE 800 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | LE, DANG D | |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2834 | |
| | | DATE MAILED: 04/29/2003 | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| , | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Office Andieus Communication | 09/936,949 | LYNG, RAGNER | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| TI MANUNO DATE SUI | Dang D Le | 2834 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| 2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Thi | is action is non-final. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| - 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>13-33</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>13-33</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>15 May 2002</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | | | | |
| 13)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | | | |
| a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: | | | | | | |
| 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). | | | | | | |
| a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 1. | 5) Notice of Informal | y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | | |
| LC Datast and Trademork Office | | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/936,949

Art Unit: 2834

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains the word "comprising" at line 4. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claim 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marsh et al.

Regarding claims 13 and 18, Marsh et al. show all of the limitations of the claimed invention.

4. Claims 13-15, 17, 22-25, 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Forbes et al.

Regarding claim 13, Forbes et al. show a stator element for use in a rotating electric machine that is preferably of the transverse flux type, characterized in that said stator element (Figure 19) is constructed having a single pole piece (63), a single flux-conducting section (59) and a single coil core part (157), all integral as one solid piece, with the flux-conducting section (59) between the pole piece and the coil core part.

Regarding claims 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22-25, 28-30, and 33, it is noted that Forbes et al. also show all of the limitations of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 18, it is noted that Forbes et al. also show an opening (on side 155 for coil).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 16, 21, 26, 27, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forbes et al. in view of Heidelberg.

Regarding claims 16, 21, 26, 27, 31 and 32, Forbes et al. show all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for it being shaped from pressure-formed and heat-treated iron powder material.

Heidelberg shows that it is shaped from pressure-formed and heat-treated iron powder material for the purpose of improving efficiency.

Since Forbes et al. and Heidelberg are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use iron powder as taught by Heidelberg for the purpose discussed above.

Application/Control Number: 09/936,949

Art Unit: 2834

Information on How to Contact USPTO

Page 4

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dang D Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-0156. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

April 23, 2003

DANG LE